

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 6-11 and 14-23 were rejected. In this Response, claims 1, 9, 14, 15, 21 and 23 have been amended and claims 24-28 have been added. The amendments and added claims are fully supported by the originally filed application. No new matter is added.

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 6-11, and 14-28 are now pending, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11, and 14-23 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,763,095 to Cermak et al. (hereinafter "Cermak") in view of U.S. Pat. App. No. 2002/0128036 to Yach et al. (hereinafter "Yach") and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,640,239 to Gidwani (hereinafter "Gidwani").

Claims 2 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over the above prior art in further view of U.S. Pat. App. No. to Kaaresoja et al. (hereinafter "Kaaresoja").

1. Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11, and 14-23

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,763,095 to Cermak et al. (hereinafter "Cermak") in view of U.S. Pat. App. No. 2002/0128036 to Yach et al. (hereinafter "Yach") and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,640,239 to Gidwani (hereinafter "Gidwani"). The Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Cermak with the unified event listing functionality of Yach and the unified communications method of Gidwani in order to arrive at the recitations of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, to further prosecution, Applicants have further amended claim 1 to clearly recite a method that includes

- displaying, in response to a user request, a plurality of messages of a plurality of message types from a plurality of communication partners, and
- particularizing, in response to another user request, the list of messages of multiple message types of multiple communication partners, to include

only messages of multiple message types of a single communication partner.

In maintaining the rejection, the Examiner relied on Gidwani as teaching “particularizing a list of communication messages to include messages specific to a communication partner.” However, as noted earlier, claim 1 recites the “particularizing...” from “a list of messages of a plurality of message types of a plurality of communication partners.” A careful reading of Gidwani shows that that Gidwani merely teaches “particularizing to a list of messages of different message types of a single user” from “a plurality of messages of a single message type of a plurality of communication partners.” See Fig 9, where 907 (from which the particularized list 914 of messages of multiple types of multiple partners is spawned) is a list of messages of the single voice type from a plurality of communication partners. List 907 is listed in response to the selection of voice message type icon 904. Different message type icons 904 are provided for voice messages, emails, fax and so forth. Thus Gidwani teach away from claim 1. Therefore, even if the examiner’s reading of Cermak and Yach is correct (a point need not be addressed at this time), the combination of Gidwani with Cermak and Yach nonetheless failed to teach or suggest each and every recitation of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claim 1 is non-obvious and patentable over the cited references.

Claim 9 includes similar recitations discussed above for claim 1. Therefore, for at least similar reasons, claim 9 is patentable over the cited references. In the interest to further prosecution, claim 9 has also been amended to include the recitations that to facilitate the unified viewing of messages, unified message objects are maintained in addition to maintaining email, text and voice messages as email, text and voice message objects respectively. The unified message objects include pointers pointing to corresponding ones of the email, text and voice message objects. These recitations are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

Claims 3, 6-8, 11 and 14-23 depend from either claim 1 or 9, incorporating their recitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 3, 6-8, 11 and 14-23 are patentable over the cited references.

Kaaresoja does not cure the above discussed deficiencies of Cermak, Yach and Gidwani. Thus claim 1 and 9 remain patentable even when Kaaresoja is further included. Claims 2 and 10 depend from claims 1 and 9 respectively including their recitations. Therefore, claims 2 and 10 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

New claims

New claims 24-28 include recitations discussed earlier for claim 9. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 24-28 are patentable over the cited references. Further, claims 24-28 recite transitioning from a composition state to the unified message viewing state. This feature is not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 6-11, and 14-28 are solicited. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Date: October 1, 2008 by: /AI AuYeung/
AI AuYeung
Reg. No.: 35,432

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
U.S. Bank Centre
1420 5th, Suite 3010
Seattle, Washington 98101
Telephone: 206-622-1711